ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 6/8/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED000721	8165	

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Transplanted Students: A Report of the National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Inst. of International Edu.
ST. 1 E. 67th St.
CITY. New York 21, NY
TELE. EXT.
INST/LCC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Institute of International Education

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	61	19

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ■ NO □

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES □ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES □ NO □

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL □
IN-PROGRESS □
FINAL ■
FOLLOW-UP □

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

conferences	objectives	background	foreign langs.
students	admissions	credit	cultural factors
undergraduate edu.	experience	financial aid	supervision
		evaluation	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A summary of a conference held in October 1960 to investigate multiple problems of study abroad. Conference discussions dealt with educational objectives, overcrowding, selection and preparation of students, foreign experience and credit toward the A.B. degree, scholarship aid, and evaluation of results. Other problems discussed pointed to the need for foreign language proficiency and cultural immersion, to the desirability of a clearinghouse of information, and to the critical choice of supervision of students (directors, leaders, and staff).

The conference was sponsored cooperatively by the Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel, the Experiment in International Living, and the Institute of International Education.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

R-6-21

8165

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TRANSPLANTED STUDENTS

A Report of The National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad

Association of American Colleges

Council on Student Travel

Experiment in International Living

Institute of International Education

ED000721

8165

Additional copies available at 50 cents a copy

Published by
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
800 Second Avenue
New York 17, N.Y.

June 1961

347

TRANSPLANTED STUDENTS

A Report of

The National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad

October 1960 *Chicago, Illinois*

THE PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE

Higher education in the United States has been characterized since the early 19th century by an increasing variety and pluralism. In the past few years we have begun to export this diversity. Undergraduate study abroad, once rare, is becoming an increasingly common feature of the college and university scene. In 1950, ten colleges offered students an opportunity to spend all or part of an academic year abroad; ten years later the number had grown to seventy. In addition to the traditional "Junior Year Abroad" countries of France, Spain and Germany, twenty-eight other nations were host to visiting American undergraduate scholars in 1959-60. In the fall of 1960, fifteen new programs were inaugurated and seventy additional institutions indicated that they were contemplating the future establishment of academic credit programs in a foreign country.

Such explosive growth has spawned problems at a faster rate than their solutions. What are the acceptable goals of these transplanted students? Should overseas programs be designed for advanced students who have already selected a major concentration or are they more suitable for the general education emphasis of the freshman and sophomore years? Does the American student need the same personnel services abroad to which he has grown accustomed on his home campus? Who can best provide instruction—an expatriate American faculty or an existing host university faculty? To what sources may United States educators turn for advice and assistance in developing and improving their academic programs overseas?

It was to answer this last question and to explore the possible answers to hundreds of other questions that the National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad was held in Chicago in October of 1960. The Conference was sponsored cooperatively by four organizations—the Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel, the Experiment in International Living and the Institute of International Education. Four major foundations—the Danforth Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the

Hazen Foundation and the Corning Glass Educational Foundation—provided the financial support without which the Conference would have been impossible. Henry M. Halsted III, formerly of the National Education Association and now with the Associated Colleges of the Mid-West, served as secretary in organizing the conference.

The pages which follow attempt to capture the essence of what 500 of the most-interested and best-qualified educators in this country and abroad discussed during a day and a half of conference. The Committee is indebted to John Wallace of the Experiment in International Living who edited the conference record. In preparing and distributing this report the Continuing Committee, representing the four sponsoring organizations, is seeking to achieve two major goals:

> to stimulate those who plan and administer existing programs of overseas academic work to analyze and examine objectively these existing programs and
>
> to provide assistance which may enable those who plan future programs to do so more effectively.

The Committee is continuing to meet and is studying ways and means of improving undergraduate programs including the possible establishment of a clearing house.

J. Ralph Murray
President, Elmira College
Chairman, Conference Planning
and Organizing Committee

June 1961

PREFACES TO THE DISCUSSION

The opening statements of the essential problems of undergraduate study abroad were made in a series of four short addresses by educators with long and varied experience in the field of higher education.

Professor Jacques Courvoisier of the University of Geneva spoke from the vantage point of a host institution overseas. Like the Universities of London, Paris and Munich, Geneva has long received more than its share of American students. Space does not permit the publication of Professor Courvoisier's complete text; the essence has been distilled in the lines below.

It is desirable that the student coming into the host university abroad:

1. Have a sufficient knowledge of the language used in the university.
2. Arrive not before the junior year. Regular matriculation is not possible until after the sophomore year.
3. Be a good, able and intelligent student in order to assume as easily as possible the supplementary effort required by the transplantation.
4. Have a sufficient basis in *Studium Generale* to be able to appreciate what is learned and be at the same time both sympathetic and, in the best sense of the word, critical.
5. Be committed to work; not to come as a university tourist. Each student in a foreign country is an ambassador of his own country.
6. Be screened, if at all possible, by the host country university before being accepted for matriculation.

One of the many varieties of overseas programs is that represented by Antioch Education Abroad. Antioch's foreign activity began in 1957 under the administration of its president, Samuel B. Gould. At the time of the conference, Dr. Gould was Chancellor of the University of California at Santa Barbara. His speech highlighted four major principles:

ASSIMILATION. Study abroad programs should be assimilated into the regular curricular program of the institution. Such a program without full academic responsibility and recognition is doomed soon to become a peripheral frill and unworthy of the effort required to keep it going.

PERSUASION. There is first of all the necessity for persuading the faculty as to the worthiness of departing from the normal and accepted procedures to which they have become accustomed. A second aspect of persuasion has to do with the students. They must interpret correctly the high degree of academic responsibility placed upon them and the high standards of intellectual quality demanded of them. The third aspect of persuasion exerts its strength upon the community. The community that is persuaded of the vital necessity for having the program will come to its support actively.

CONCENTRATION. It is better both from an academic and administrative

point of view to concentrate all of an institution's efforts in study abroad upon one country and, indeed, upon one university within that country.

CONTINUATION. A program of importance must be pursued long enough to ensure that it has had full opportunity to prove its worth. Only then does it stand a chance to become a part of the permanent educational pattern.

But the game is worth not just the candle; it is worth a whole power plant of light-giving energy. Those of you who have seen what can happen even with the limited resources already put to use understand this well. You know what can happen in the lives of the young men and women and thus in the life of the world when we make possible for them this new highway toward cultural and humane enlightenment.

Already apparent in the overseas educational field is the trend toward more programs in non-western areas. Representative of the attitudes of one possible future host government were the remarks of Professor K. G. Saiyidain of the Ministry of Education of India.

I invite you to consider whether everything that is seemingly good enough is *really* important enough to deserve a high priority. In some countries where financial resources are limited and many deserving claimants compete for them that cruel question would almost automatically bar many well-meaning schemes.

It is difficult for foreign students to adjust themselves to such different educational patterns and systems. So they remain, I gather, like an island in an ocean against which the waves may strike but the island does not thereby become an integral part of the ocean.

At a somewhat immature age students are more likely to be swept away by the impact of an entirely new experience . . . which may dazzle the eyes without necessarily illuminating the mind. Let me, however, make it clear that I consider it quite likely that under wise and careful leadership such visits might become a rewarding personal experience. Your major objective in such a program is to broaden the vision of your students, to give them a warm feeling of belonging to a fellowship of mankind which cuts across national, racial and geographical frontiers and to quicken their social sensitiveness to the human scene. The issues we face today are so important and complicated that they cannot be left to the "superior wisdom" of the political elite; they have to be brought home to everyone who has any part to play in the determination of national policies and programs. (This is) the bigger, more basic task that we have to accomplish if the great challenge of the twentieth century is to be faced successfully and with dignity and courage.

A long-time participant in many of the Junior Year Abroad programs for language majors has been Mt. Holyoke College. Its President, Richard Glenn Gettell, was also Chairman of the Commission on International

Understanding of the Association of American Colleges. President Gettell in his address postulated two axioms about liberal education in the United States.

> Each generation of students should be trained and encouraged to self-development so that its individual members can effectively face the next fifty years. It is clear that the preparation of our college-age youth must lay great stress on breadth of understanding and the development of flexibility and adaptability to that which is *today unforeseen*, which as yet neither we nor they have experienced.
>
> Today's students should prepare to address themselves to the problems of the world, not only of their own nations. We cannot avoid our responsibility to, and our dependence upon, other members of the family of nations. We cannot, we dare not, be oblivious to the surging changes beyond our shores.
>
> One of the major responses colleges are making to the requirements of this situation is the introduction of exchange of persons programs. International exchange, through a program of undergraduate study abroad, is frequently accepted without further examination, as a well-intentioned idea. Like other well-intentioned ideas, its success depends on its execution and not on its intention. Uncritical expansion of foreign study can lead to nothing short of disaster.
>
> It is easy to paint a black picture of an avalanche of immature, irresponsible youngsters, descending upon foreign institutions, unprepared to share intellectually in what they are offered, enjoying a purposeless *wanderjahr*, reaching superficial judgments about their experiences and performing as undesirable representatives of America. It is easy to see how they could add to misunderstanding, as is too often the case with tourists, and wear out the welcome of others who could truly profit from the experience at a foreign university. And it is easy to see that even when some value accrues from study abroad, it may be an ill-timed interruption of the formal academic process, too little related to the program and the purposes of the institution from which they depart and to which they return as undergraduates. Foreign study can be an integral part, a supplement to, or a distraction from, an orderly academic program.
>
> Clearly, given the wide diversity of American educational programs, we cannot expect that there is one good way of arranging foreign study, that we shall find it this week end and henceforth agree to eschew all others. But we do have an opportunity to examine carefully the strengths and weaknesses of existing programs, to ask ourselves and each other, in an organized fashion, the difficult questions that really define our problem. The answers will determine whether our well-intentioned idea is building to a colossal flop, whether it is a mixed blessing, or whether it is a significant new ingredient in American education.

A SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS

The conference rapporteur was Stephen A. Freeman, Vice President and Dean of Middlebury College. At the closing session of the conference Dr. Freeman summarized the discussions of the many groups and seminars. His remarks were later printed in their entirety in Liberal Education, *the Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges. They are reprinted here as a part of this conference report with permission from the Association.*

The footnotes appearing in this summary at the few points where Dean Freeman's remarks appeared to need further emphasis or clarification have been added by the Continuing Committee of the conference. All footnotes have been taken from reports of the conference's workshops and seminars.

The conferees would probably agree that of all their conclusions none is more important than this: look before you leap into the ocean, and having looked, leap carefully.

It is manifestly impossible for one man to summarize in fifteen minutes all that 450 people have said in a full day of intensive discussion: the plans that have been described, the questions raised, the solutions proposed, the suggestions given. It is also evident that the immense variety and the imaginative differences among the more than eighty foreign study programs in operation this year make generalization highly dangerous. Yet I cannot go into details. I have been asked to state the achievements of this conference, the conclusions which you have reached. The achievement of the conference is in a word the opportunity for the four sponsoring organizations to make statements which will have your authority behind them. I have been asked to give my own feeling as to these statements. I do not expect that everyone will agree with all that I shall say. This conference has been characterized, as it should be, by many divergent opinions and by healthy disagreements on policy and implementation. I shall try to present the consensus where I think it exists.

I hope that you will recognize many phrases quoted from the discussions, reports, addresses and also from the printed material which has formed the background of this conference. May I also beg the privilege of speaking very frankly and unequivocally? This conference has achieved its objective only in so far as it has laid down positive guidelines and leveled clear constructive criticism at what it feels to be unwise policies, dangerous situations and even perhaps shoddy programs. This may well hurt in some quarters, but we must at all costs prevent the present disorganized scramble to send students abroad from turning into an educational scandal.

We may, therefore, begin with President Getell's axioms of last evening. We all agree that international education for the American undergraduate

is not only a well-intentioned idea, but that it can be a good thing if wisely and properly executed. The conference has gone to the root of the matter in demanding first of all that each program clearly define its objectives. Point 1 of the conference achievements is the definition of the educational objective of every program.

There are several possible: general education—that is, the humanizing, broadening contact with a portion of the world scene; or secondly, an intensive study of the language, literature and culture of a foreign country; or thirdly, specialized study in some particular aspect of the student's program, whether his major or some other field.

International understanding as generally interpreted is an institutional and a national objective rather than an objective of the individual student.[1] Essentially, then, the objectives of an overseas study program are the same as those of the home institution. It is true that some students can attain some of these goals better for a period spent in a foreign study scene. I must point out, however, that it is impossible to do everything at the same time. One of the dangers of our programs is that they issue blurbs containing vague generalities covering the waterfront of everything that might be achieved in a foreign study program.

Many unworthy objectives have been mentioned at this conference. Some colleges start a program because they want to be in the swim—because other colleges are doing it. I even heard it stated as an objective that the program will make room for more students on the home campus. If ever there was an unworthy objective, what amounts to dumping our students on already overcrowded foreign universities, this is surely one.

We must remember that there is no value in going abroad to study if you can study better at home. In our American educational system, every institution has a right to create its own program just as it pleases, without regard for any other institution, but this conference goes on record, I believe, as demanding that the aims and objectives of each program be explicit—that they be stated exactly in terms of what the institution hopes to accomplish and what the student may hope to accomplish.

Point 2 deals with the question "how?" How are these aims and objectives to be arrived at? They require a clear, precise definition of the program—the curriculum, the courses to be offered and the extra-curricular activities of the students. Most undergraduates going from the United States to foreign countries are not really in a foreign university at all. It is a gross misrepresentation to lead the student to believe that under an overseas study program he will be enrolled in a foreign university at the sophomore or junior level. In many foreign universities, the A.B. is required as the

---

1. The conferees agreed that national goals and policies should not be advanced overseas by expecting transplanted students to proselytize actively for these policies; but that each student should seek consciously in his behavior to represent appropriately the national ideals.

equivalent of the baccalaureate. Even if such American students are matriculated, they are not candidates for foreign degrees, certificates or diplomas. They are not sitting for the real foreign examinations. That means then that one of three possibilities takes place: either the students enroll in special courses organized by the host university for foreigners; or secondly, they may be enrolled in special courses organized by the American institution but taught by foreign professors employed by the American institution; or thirdly, they may be enrolled in programs taught by an exported American faculty—in other words, an overseas branch of an American institution.

It should also be made clear to the American student that foreign study is not as effective for courses in the physical sciences and the social sciences as in the humanities or in foreign languages and literatures. This is because laboratories are not available to undergraduates in foreign institutions as they are in American undergraduate colleges. The courses offered by the foreign university in economics, political science, psychology and the like are usually too specialized and too advanced to be within the ken of an American junior, unless he has already specialized more than usually in those fields. And most of all, in order to study those courses, a much better knowledge of the foreign language and technical vocabulary is required than the usual sophomore or junior possesses.

American students miss the introductory courses which they should take at their American college at the sophomore level; or they miss, if they go over in the junior year, the advanced courses which they should take in their major at home. It requires very skillful managing of the courses at home and full cooperation of the home faculty for a pre-law, pre-medical or pre-engineering student to take a year out. We must not expect to duplicate abroad the courses of the home college, nor even to present the equivalent. We must recognize that it is a different educational experience, and that the courses cannot be equated in terms of the American college.

Point 3 is cooperation—cooperation, first, among American colleges in order to avoid duplication of programs. There must be in the future a much greater sharing of programs to avoid multiplicity, confusion and duplication of effort. Highly important also is greater cooperation than now exists with foreign universities, to make sure that the program that we set up or hope to set up is welcome in the host university.[2]

It has been pointed out that foreign tuition fees are low. This is because they are subsidized by the government—that is, by the taxpayers of the foreign country. Is it not true that we are profiteering when we keep

---

2. *Academic Programs Abroad,* Report of a Special Conference. Institute of International Education, New York, 1960. "United States educators planning foreign study programs should also realize that in addition to the universities in the host nation there are many types of advanced institutions—technical, professional and even general—which in the United States would be classified as colleges and that many of these institutions would be interested in working with American colleges and universities."

the cost to an American student low simply because the foreign tuition fee is low compared to ours? There is also the matter of overcrowding. There is already a serious shortage of places in most European universities—especially in the capitals and in the big-name universities. We shall not be welcome to augment the flood that now seems to be preparing. The cost of living in foreign countries has been mentioned, and it is worth while to point out that the cost of living, say in France, can be kept very low if the student eats in the government-subsidized student restaurants; but he gets a very false impression of the cost of living for ordinary citizens, when part of every meal he eats is paid for by the government.

This matter of cooperation brings us to Point 4: we must set up a clearing house of information through which cooperation may be channeled. Such a clearing house should include at least four aspects: (1) detailed information on programs which are available, and the fields of study which are available in foreign countries—in other words, a whole set of information about what can be studied by undergraduate Americans overseas; (2) the bases for cooperation between the American and the foreign university, as was suggested to this conference by Professor Courvoisier; (3) a coordinated approach to contacts with foreign universities rather than the scramble that Dr. Gould described in suggesting that it would be well for us to consider that one institution in this country concentrate upon one country, or on one university, through the aid of such a clearing house; (4) the evolution of standards by which these programs can be judged, a definition of quality without which a program must fail and some sort of a code of ethics to govern the establishment of new programs. We need guidance on policy, and it cannot be provided by single institutions.

We now come to Point 5, the selection and preparation of students. This has been much discussed, and very valuably, in this conference. It is evident that the selection of students must be keyed to the program as defined and published, and that the selection must be made early. I think it was generally agreed in our discussions that it is dangerous to send an entire class or to set up a compulsory program. The qualifications to profit by foreign study are not the same as the qualifications to enter as a freshman in an undergraduate college in the United States. Foreign university students are a much more select group than our freshmen or sophomores. University students abroad are generally in the top five per cent intellectually of their age group, and they have a maturity and a background of classical education which is far greater than that of our students.[3]

---

3. It was reported from one of the seminars that there was a feeling that "A student committee can serve a useful purpose working along with the faculty in the selection of young people to go abroad. Such a student committee may help to stress the fact that while a record of substantial academic achievement is essential for an overseas program applicant maturity and flexibility are equally important."

As for criteria of selection: high character, emotional maturity, stability, seriousness of purpose, eagerness to work, dependability for coping with the greater freedom and independence of a foreign campus—all these have been wisely mentioned. It has been pointed out that neither the BMOAC nor the maverick are necessarily to be chosen. Professor Courvoisier has made a plea for the "extra," that is, the supplement of intelligence, the ability to adapt; for each student is a representative of American culture and should represent it adequately. These must be quality programs, and the quality of the program depends largely upon the quality of the student that we send.

Having screened our students carefully, we must prepare them for this experience through planned orientation. This we have fatally neglected. Much of the current orientation consists of desultory lectures on shipboard. There should be a college course—more than mere travel tips—on all phases of the civilization and culture of the foreign country, keyed into an anthropological analysis of the culture of our own country. Then, on return, there must be a follow-up—a "post-preparation"—a seminar of some kind for the assimilation of the year's experience into the whole course of the student's undergraduate work. He must be given an opportunity to continue his comparative study and to use his experience effectively after he returns to this country—hopefully with benefit to the entire campus.

Point 6, part of the necessary preparation, is a knowledge of the relevant foreign language. We except, of course, English-speaking nations and countries, such as India and some African countries, where English is the common language of communication. But with these exceptions, a working mastery of the foreign language is a vital, indispensable possession of the student. He must have it in order to do any real study at a foreign university. Without it, any type of specialized work is impossible for him, or even any real immersion in the culture of the foreign country or any understanding of the community.

It is perfectly possible for a student who knows no foreign language to live in a home in a foreign country and learn with difficulty after three weeks how to ask for the salt at table, but I see hardly any possibility of mature discussion of ideas until after six months of intensive language practice have passed. Without a working knowledge of the foreign language, the student will be isolated; his program must be based upon an island in the foreign culture; his courses will have to be taught in English. So he must spend six months on an intensive study of the language, with high motivation, of course, and no doubt making rapid progress. But would it not be better if he had the foreign language before he went, so that his time in the foreign country could be used to better purpose? By a working mastery, we mean the ability to speak intelligently on adult topics. It cannot be acquired in six months. It needs a basis of at least three years in high school and two in college, taught by an audio-lingual method.

I might say parenthetically that in the English universities, the question

is somewhat different. Oxford and Cambridge do not normally accept American undergraduates at all; and many of the other English universities will take an undergraduate only if he has already begun a strong specialization of from fifteen to eighteen hours in a particular field, so that he can read advanced material with a tutor. This is not possible for sophomores or usually even for juniors.

Finally, if an objective of the program is to learn the foreign language from scratch (as is the case with some programs), it should be so stated, and there should be no talk about studying in a foreign university, nor about international understanding, until after the language has been acquired.

Point 7, cultural immersion is stated to be a major objective of all or most of the programs. May I say that total immersion—speaking untheologically—is possible only if the student (1) has a good speaking knowledge of the foreign language, (2) is fully enrolled in a foreign academic institution, (3) is living with a foreign family and sharing intimately in their life and (4) has been fully briefed about the foreign culture before he goes. These are prime requisites for total immersion, but they are evidently very difficult to attain for large numbers. If, on the other hand, the institution defines its objective as sprinkling—partial immersion—and honestly so states, it may be acceptable if the student knows what he is in for.[4]

There are many dangers and difficulties in this business of immersion. Living with a family in a foreign country is difficult—in some countries almost impossible. Simply being in a foreign community guarantees nothing in the way of understanding. Personal contact may be repugnant to the student as well as to the person with whom he comes in contact. As Professor Saiyidain has said, the impressions of unprepared undergraduates may be not only extremely superficial but dangerous. It should be frankly stated that some programs, which send students without careful screening and without a good knowledge of the foreign language and which create special programs of American study overseas, are definitely in the tour business. Many good results may be achieved by these programs, but they are cheating the customer if they talk of foreign study and international understanding.

The question of timing, Point 8, has been much discussed in the conference. When is the foreign experience most valuable? No conclusion was reached. Freshmen and sophomores are probably the most impressionable and consequently may receive the greatest impact for general education. But

---

4. "While a student can have a much more intimate experience of a culture than a tourist, there are some limitations to a student's opportunity as well. He may achieve a measure of acceptance among his fellow students and take an active part in their activities but the university world is itself something of a distinctive sub-culture. In European society a student enjoys a certain status which sets him apart and the foreign student has been perceived and treated in a special way for centuries."

Overseas Travel-Study Programs in U.S. Higher Education, background paper prepared for the Association for Higher Education 1961 conference. Irwin S. Abrams, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

we must remember that they cannot really enter a foreign university. At best an American branch program with some personal contact with the foreign culture is well worth while: at worst it may be a travel tour with academic overtones. The junior year seems to have gained the widest support, but it creates difficulties in the home college for the major program. Most colleges require the senior year in residence. All our foreign guests at this conference have urged us to let the experience come as late as possible. Many times we find that a student can have only one year of study abroad. In that case I believe with Professor Courvoisier that it may be best to postpone it until the graduate stage. Graduate students have better preparation; they are more mature; they are more nearly equal to their fellow-students in the foreign country.[5]

Point 9, credit toward the A.B. degree, is a most important practical matter. It is evident, unfortunately, that most programs would collapse if full credit for the time spent abroad was not given. This does not necessarily mean a duplication of campus courses, but the work abroad should be equivalent in intellectual value at least. We must demand honest education. We must demand real effort and hard work equivalent to what we demand on campus, with final examinations or some other type of final control. Too many of our programs depend too much on the "osmosis" which we hope will take place.

Careful and direct supervision by the American college which is sponsoring the program and granting the credit is the only effective way to accredit or evaluate. There is definitely a question as to how much real supervision can be given to a student when the college sends him on his own to a foreign country; or when a college sends many students to a dozen different countries. It is impossible for the American college to shift the responsibility to a foreign agent. Then there is the thorny question of what to do with a student who goes off on his own without sponsorship and even possibly without our permission. He is often the student who is impatient of discipline. No credits should be allowed until the results of his year have been rigorously examined by the home faculty in terms of solid academic achievement. We do not give credit toward a degree for "a maturing experience." If we did, we should give credit to students who flunk out.

Point 10, the choice of the director or leader of the group, and also of his staff, is naturally of major importance for the supervision of the group. The conference has listed a number of criteria. He must be familiar with the foreign university and with the foreign educational system. He must be fluent in the foreign language. He must be familiar with the culture and

---

5. The dominant feeling of the conference was summed up in the report from one seminar which stated, "We feel that to the extent that the institution attempts to emphasize general education goals or the liberal arts in its overseas program, the program is best placed in the sophomore year. On the other hand, those which deepen a student's experience in his academic major field belong obviously in the junior or senior year."

customs of the country. He must have a dynamic, decisive, understanding personality, and he should be adequately paid for a tough job. This is not a job to be handed around as a fringe benefit to members of the faculty as a sort of vacation, nor in an attempt to educate the home faculty to the benefits of a foreign program.

Point 11, these programs are too often open only to the wealthy, and this must not be the basis of selection. Many programs charge only regular campus fee, sometimes with the cost of one-way transportation added. We have already spoken of the unfair use of low tuitions abroad. Scholarship committees are being forced, and rightly so, to re-examine policy on the holding of college scholarships during the year abroad. No general international understanding can result if programs are limited to the few who can afford to take part.

Point 12, the evaluation of results—for the student, for the institution and for the nation—depends on a great many complex factors. We need more research. We need research in the analysis of changing attitudes. It is not only the factual that we are interested in. But evaluation, however difficult, must be attempted better than it is now, and it must be made as scientific as possible. We have yet many questions to answer. How long a stay abroad is necessary to achieve significant general educational values? What type of student profits most? What level is the best? How valuable are the branch American colleges overseas? What new dimensions can be added by overseas study programs to the American system of education?

This conference has not found all the answers nor achieved final formulation of all the desirable policies, but it has taken a long step forward in bringing basic information together and in clarifying the issues. The potentialities of this movement are enormous. The complex and divergent trends are both stimulating and disturbing. We must proceed in full cooperation, but with wisdom and caution.

THE VARIETIES OF OVERSEAS ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The nature of an overseas academic program will reflect in large measure its basic goals. Once the goals have been defined, however, major choices face the institution in each of the following areas.

1. DURATION OF PROGRAM
   a. Short-term—one quarter, one semester, two quarters
   b. Long-term—one academic year or more

2. PLACEMENT IN A FOUR-YEAR PROGRAM
   a. Late freshman or sophomore year—usual for general education programs
   b. Junior or senior year—usual for advanced, specialized programs

3. RELATIONSHIP TO ACADEMIC INSTITUTION IN HOST COUNTRY
   a. Programs completely separate from any academic institution. Includes independent study programs as well as expatriate campuses
   b. Programs providing special courses for American students taught at or by the host institution
   c. Enrollment in regular courses of host institution

4. SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS
   a. Open to any student meeting the college's usual requirement for "good standing"
   b. Specialized academic requirements—knowledge of foreign language, specified grade point ratio, completion of prerequisite courses
   c. Screening to determine personality suitability for overseas experience

5. LEADERSHIP
   a. Students permitted to function independently
   b. Leadership provided by host institution overseas
   c. Leadership provided by home institution
   d. Leadership shared with other institutions or organization

6. HOUSING
   a. Students housed under one roof as a group
   b. Students housed with host institution's students
   c. Students placed with selected host families
   d. Students given freedom of choice in housing

Within each of these categories there are obviously possibilities for compromise choices. A college may elect to discharge its leadership function

by providing a U.S. faculty member for the first month of the program and then turn over responsibility to a member of the host faculty. A one-semester program may be augmented by a student's securing permission for a summer's independent study project before or after his formal program. One institution has a program which overlaps both the sophomore and junior years.

Given such a range of choice, then, it becomes obvious why no two programs are exactly alike in this burgeoning field of educational effort. It is still too early to determine whether the future will witness greater uniformity of pattern or whether diversity will continue to characterize the field. Colleges and universities contemplating a move toward an overseas program are urged to seek competent advice in attempting to evaluate the hundreds of possible combinations of decisions possible in the above areas. A suggested approach for such future efforts in this field follows.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OVERSEAS ACADEMIC PROGRAM

WITHIN THE INSTITUTION

1. The goals for a foreign study program should be clearly and carefully framed by a college or university committee representing the administration, the faculty and the student body. These goals should be related closely to the stated educational aims of the institution.
2. The committee or someone designated by it should study the available literature in the field. Other institutions' programs with similar goals should also be analyzed. (See suggested reading list attached.)
3. The committee should assess student interest, the possibility of adapting the local curriculum to provide for study abroad and the financial implications of the program both for the institution and the students.
4. Tentative program outlines should be prepared and discussed not only with those concerned within the institution (major advisers, language department heads, etc.) but with outside experts of the kind suggested below.
5. The committee should seek out other institutions with which the college or university might co-operate or, alternatively, attempt to discover other institutions with which the college might join in establishing a new program.
6. A survey should be made of the cultural resources and educational facilities of the proposed host area overseas. Whenever possible such survey should consist of an actual visit; in some cases it may be possible to secure this information without extensive overseas travel.
7. The final program plan should be established. If the size or uniqueness of the program justifies it, it may well function independently. To the greatest possible extent, however, the program should provide for institutional co-operation.
8. Detailed plans should be made in such areas as
   a. Curriculum
   b. Selection of students and faculty members
   c. Supervision and teaching overseas
   d. Transportation, housing and other administrative matters
   e. Planned co-operation with host institutions
   f. Evaluation and follow-up experiences
9. The committee should make every possible effort to secure wide institutional support for the program before its inauguration.

OUTSIDE THE INSTITUTION — SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE

1. *Public sources*
   a. United States government
      1) Department of State — advice, possible financial assistance, information on conditions abroad
      2) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare — information on educational systems abroad
      3) U.S. Cultural Affairs Officers in the host country
   b. Foreign governments
      1) Consular offices — assistance with visas, regulations, etc.
      2) Embassies — advice from Education Officer or Cultural Affairs Officer
      3) National travel offices — information of all kinds, printed brochures, technical advice
      4) Ministry of Education in the host country — information on education

2. *Private sources*
   a. The Council on Student Travel, as a cooperative service to its member institutions, arranges low-cost transportation abroad by ship and by air, conducts shipboard orientation programs; and orientation seminars abroad, assists institutions in planning overseas programs through staff visits, conferences and publications, and generally endeavors to raise the educational standards for overseas student programs.
   b. The Experiment in International Living gives assistance with all phases of program planning: selection, orientation and training, transportation, overseas arrangements, provision of host families and local supervision of students.
   c. The Institute of International Education compiles comprehensive information on exchange programs for U.S. undergraduates, and has basic data on educational facilities abroad. The information, which is part of the Institute's traditional role as a clearing house on all aspects of international exchange, is supplied to students and college administrators through publications, conferences and individual counseling.
   d. National student organizations overseas supply information on local educational systems and assist with travel arrangements and vacation plans.
   e. The host institution will assist in the evaluation of applicants, the planning of program and other necessary services.

SOME HELPFUL REFERENCES

1. Abrams, Irwin. *Study Abroad.* (Number 6 in the Series *New Dimensions in Higher Education,* W. R. Hatch [ed.]. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.) Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
2. *Academic Programs Abroad: An Exploration of their Assets and Liabilities. Report of a Special Conference, Mt. Holyoke College.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1960.
3. *A Report on Three Seminars on Academic Programs Abroad.* New York: Council on Student Travel, 1960.
4. *A Report on the Oberlin Conference on Summer Study Programs Abroad for American Undergraduates.* Oberlin: Oberlin College.
5. Cleveland, Harlan, Adams, John Clarke, and Mangone, Gerard J. *The Overseas Americans.* New York: Mc-Graw-Hill, 1960.
6. Garraty, John A., and Adams, Walter. *From Main Street to the Left Bank. Students and Scholars Abroad.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1960.
7. Morrill, J. L. [Chairman]. *Report of the Committee on the University and World Affairs.* New York: Ford Foundation, 1960.
8. *Programs for U.S. Undergraduates in Other Countries. A Survey of Present and Proposed Programs.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1960.
9. Shank, Donald J. "The American Goes Abroad," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Vol. 335), 1961.
10. Shank, Donald J. *The Junior Year Abroad: A Critical Look.* New York: Institute of International Education, 1960.
11. "Young Americans Abroad." *Carnegie Corporation of New York, Quarterly* (Vol. IX, No. 1), 1961.